

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO**

**KRISTEN R, through her guardian and parent,
ROBIN PICKERING,**

Plaintiff,

v.

No. CIV-15-0277 RB/LAM

**EASTERN NEW MEXICO MENTAL RETARDATION
SERVICES d/b/a EASTERN NEW MEXICO
REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
FOR THE HANDICAPPED, INC., a/k/a “ENMRSH”, et al.,**

Defendants.

**ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR EXTENSION
OF ALL PRE-TRIAL DEADLINES**

THIS MATTER is before the Court on Plaintiff’s *Motion for Extension of all Pre-Trial Deadlines* [Doc. 31], filed December 18, 2015. Defendants have not filed a response to the motion, and the time for responding has passed. “The failure of a party to file and serve a response in opposition to a motion within the time prescribed for doing so constitutes consent to grant the motion.” D.N.M. LR-Civ. 7.1(b). Having considered the motion and record of the case, and having consulted with the presiding judge in this case, the Court **FINDS** that the motion is well-taken and shall be **GRANTED**. Because the discovery deadline will now be *after* the scheduled settlement conference in this case, the Court will also vacate the April 22, 2016 settlement conference and reset it at a later date.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Plaintiff's *Motion for Extension o[f] all Pre-Trial Deadlines* [Doc. 31] is **GRANTED**, and the following deadlines are extended as follows:¹

- | | |
|--|---------------------------|
| 1. Termination date for discovery: | May 23, 2016 |
| 2. Discovery motions: | June 12, 2016 |
| 3. Plaintiff's expert reports: | March 31, 2016 |
| 4. Defendants' expert reports: | April 25, 2016 |
| 5. Pretrial motions: | July 8, 2016 |
| 6. Pretrial order from Plaintiff to Defendant: | September 26, 2016 |
| 7. Pretrial order from Defendant to the Court: | October 11, 2016 |

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the settlement conference presently set for April 22, 2016 is hereby **VACATED** and will be rescheduled at a later date.

These deadlines shall not be extended again without approval of the Court upon a motion setting forth exceptional cause for extension. The press of other cases, vacations and intervening holidays are not usually considered to be exceptional circumstances.

IT IS SO ORDERED.


LOURDES A. MARTÍNEZ
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

¹ The Court notes that Plaintiff states that she expects needing an additional three months to complete discovery (Doc. 31 at 1); however, Plaintiff only asks for a two-month extension of all of the deadlines in this case (*id.* at 2). To be clear, the Court is granting this motion as to the two-month extension of the deadlines as set forth on page 2 of Plaintiff's motion.